





## THE LAND QUESTION IN NEW ZEALAND.

On this subject we find the following somewhat interesting notes by "W. F. Porter," in the *New Zealander* of Saturday, the 13th current:—

When this colony was taken possession of, it became a dependency of New South Wales, where a high price of land was established, it therefore became necessary to maintain a high price of land here, and for which purpose the Treaty of Waitangi was made, seeing that we could not take the land by force, and that the natives would not give it up. They were told distinctly that it was not intended to deprive them of their property, but that the Government would buy it from them. They appeared to have some difficulty in understanding the matter. At last an old chief settled it by saying that the *whare* was to go to the Queen, but they were to keep the substance; and the conclusion they came to. But even this treaty was only made with a few; a large portion of them knew nothing about it, and those who did sign it did not understand what they were doing, but it is perfectly clear, from a statement made by Captain Hobson, that the Government thought they had secured the land. He stated, when advised to buy up the land as speedily as possible, there was no necessity for it, there being no competition in the market. He could get it on his own terms whenever he pleased. To my mind, a man buying on his own terms, where he pleases, is little short of taking it altogether. In fact the natives were cheated, and the Europeans who had bought lands before the Government came, were afterwards robbed to keep up a high price of land for the interests of New South Wales. Captain Hobson at that time was not aware of the power of the natives, and apprehended little difficulty (having got possession) in dealing with them on his own terms. And even in Mr. Shortland's time their power was not known. Colonel Bunbury having said that with one hundred men he could go through the whole country; but they were soon undeceived by the Hoki, which originated in the land question, although the flagstaff was nominally the cause of it. The same is the case now at New Plymouth. The land question is the cause of the disturbance there, and has been almost the only cause of dispute between the Government and the natives. During the Hoki war, the good management of Captain Fitz Roy, and the peace which he brought about, were the result of his having been careful to keep up a high price of land for the interests of New South Wales. The old natives were promptly settled by Captain Fitz Roy after he arrived, but the mischief was done. Some of the land sold at less than one shilling per acre. The effect of cheap land was immediately visible in the increased cultivation and improvements which took place in the country, and many of the present settlers who are now well off owe their prosperity to that measure, and are granting which Captain Fitz Roy was so much benefited. On the arrival of Sir George Grey, a high price was re-established, which caused great dissatisfaction, and again checked the progress of this province. The New Zealand Company were then all-powerful at home, and a low price of land here would have been injurious to their interests, but when the New Zealand Company was no more, and Sir George Grey on the eve of his departure was courting popularity, he could find out that a cheaper price of land would be beneficial. Why did he not know it before? The reduction in the price of land to 10s. has had a good effect throughout the whole colony, and I believe a still lower price, and the country being thrown open, would bring in such an influx of people that we should soon far outnumber the natives, and have it in our power to make British laws respected; but while the country is locked up as at present, we can make but slow progress. The native wants to sell his land, and the European wants to buy, but is prevented by the Government. Both are dissatisfied, and I believe that my opinion is borne out by very good authority; that while we continue to buy at a low price, and sell again, before their faces, at a much higher rate, we are not safe. Do them justice, and we have nothing to fear. They know the value of us, and are anxious for the settlement of Europeans among them. Cheap land, available to all, will soon people the country; but while the country is locked up, but little progress can be made, the native wants to sell his land, and the Europeans to buy, but Government will not allow them to do so. Both are dissatisfied. The direction from the Home Government on the subject of pre-emption was, that at whatever cost the honour of her Majesty must be maintained; but in defiance of those directions Sir George Grey, in the most unwise and unfeeling manner, took the lands from them, and not satisfied with so much as to abuse them, calling them miserable land speculators. The honour of her Majesty has been compromised by taking from her European subjects land bought under Captain Fitz Roy's waiver of pre-emption, and daily compromised by preventing her Maori subjects selling and making free use of their own land, land which is acknowledged to be theirs by the Treaty of Waitangi, but by the Native Land Purchase Ordinance, any European, working even for hire, and living on native land, is liable to a penalty of one hundred pounds, he cannot even cut a stick of timber on their land without being liable to the penalty. This Ordinance was framed by Sir George Grey, the friend of the Maories, and who stated as a reason for withholding the first constitution, his fear that the European population would treat the Maories unjustly. Let us prove that he was wrong at once allowing them to do as they like with their own property. The effect will be most beneficial to us in all our other dealings with them. Having once gained their confidence, they will not mistrust us hereafter, but will believe that any laws we make affecting them are intended for their good. A good understanding will be established between the two races, and the country will prosper. On the other hand, if, for the sake of keeping up a high price, we continue to take their land from them at a low price, and sell again at a high price, the risk of another war is imminent, if it has not already commenced. Is it not better at once to concede the point while we can do it with a good grace, than be compelled to do it hereafter,

when it will come with a bad grace. A great benefit would be conferred on all by allowing the white population to mix freely with the natives. Then civilisation would be promoted, and the Europeans, of every class, would have land available on moderate terms, and the increased consumption of goods would be an advantage to people in towns, and increase the revenue. The high price of land is a tax on those who ought not to pay the whole of it, as they are not the only persons benefited by good roads and immigration. Out of the land tax, not more than one-half is profit to the Government. The New Zealand Company's fourth, the surveys, expenses of Commissioners, &c. &c. absorb the other half. If the country is thrown open, no immigration fund will be required, and the small real loss in the revenue may easily be made up in a less objectionable way by either a small transit tax, a tax on the transfer of real property, or a land tax. I have purposely avoided detail in this matter, but have considered it well, and see no difficulties but what may easily be overcome; but I do not consider this a time for going into them. This is a matter that cannot be delayed long, and the sooner it is settled the better. There are plenty of natives who can read our language, and whatever passes in this House will be known to them. We are all here to represent them as well as ourselves, and it is our duty to see substantial justice done to them. Look at the bearing of this question upon their feelings towards the natives. If we do them justice now, they will have confidence in us hereafter, and we shall give the lie to those who misrepresent us, and withheld the first Constitution for five years, for fear of us doing injustice to the natives, when at the same time he had, in the Native Land Purchase Ordinance, actually prohibited them not only from selling or leasing, but from using it in any way except by their own labour. They could not hire a European to live on their land, to work for them, and instruct them in the use of the plough, or in the art of agriculture, and which prevented the Lord Bishop from being useful to them; he having in one occasion, joined with them in cultivating their land, he found horses, ploughs, and seed, and labour; but after doing it once, he decided to the injury of both parties. The question now before the House is this—were we not able to take the native lands when first the Government came here, are you able to do so now, and is it just you should do so?

## MRS. NORTON'S APPEAL FOR DIVORCE.

(From the Leader, 14th July.)

There is a skeleton, it is said, in every house, but by a peculiar hypocrisy, almost unparalleled in the history of mankind, English society agrees to ignore the domestic monstrosity, and affects to disbelieve in the existence of skeletons anywhere, except in disreputable neighbourhoods or ill-regulated families. In the main these subjects are treated only as cases of individual irregularity; instances that become known are pronounced to be "exceptional," and the very custom that discourages the overt allusion to all facts in such circumstances helps to render the disclosure exceptional, although the fact is little so. There is, indeed, not a tale which comes out which does not imply, if it does not absolutely prove, that many families are implicated in each of the so-called exceptional cases; and sometimes they are so manifestly connected in the chain of the larger part of the Peerage, a great province of the landed gentry, with no small contingents from the moneyed and the middle classes. We need say nothing about the working classes, because it is not the custom to consider them as belonging to "society;" and when we point to the flagrant departure from established law in whole sections of the great bulk of the people, the answer is that such occurrences belong only to the ignorant and vulgar. It is this extraordinary substitution of presumption, sanctions the perpetuation of injustice. Sometimes from the penitential of the household comes the ghastly cry, uttered by the living voice before the skeleton becomes ossified into an heirloom. But the cry is always stifled, if possible, or is politely disregarded. Hence it is the practice to maintain laws that have no relation to the actual state of society in this country; and this maintenance is obstinate, even after those who are the highest authorities on such subjects have made up their minds that the law cannot and ought not to be maintained. There is, for instance, no greater instance of flagrant injustice, violating every principle of equity, humanity, and decency, than the existing law with respect to divorce. The judges of the land, the chancellors and ex-chancellors, the lords, bishops and lay saints, agree to report that some change ought to take place. One at least. They admit the causes of divorce existing as much amongst the poor as amongst the rich, yet, at present, divorce from the bond of marriage is not to be obtained without an Act of Parliament or the hundreds of pounds which that form of relief costs. The law is open to all men, and James Stockport and Dinah his wife, the Manchester weavers, can obtain a divorce, if they will procure the witnesses, arrange the evidence, employ the counsel, and pay for the Act of Parliament. James and Dinah generally go a shorter way to work, and render themselves open to various criminal and civil proceedings.

One interested victim, Mrs. Norton—growing under a bondage where she is bound yet alone, enslaved yet unprotected—has taken an eloquent appeal in "A Letter to the Queen," on that Divorce Bill with which Lord Chancellor Cranworth has tantalised Parliament, and the hopes of her Majesty's people. Mrs. Norton shows how in the existing state of the law a woman may be exposed to persecution of every kind. She was charged with infidelity to her husband in an action brought against Lord Melbourne, and although, as she affirms in the most solemn language, innocent, and prepared to establish her innocence, she was shut out from the court. She was separated from her husband by consent, and after separation he invades her separate property, examines her books at her banker's, subpoenas her publishers, and compels them to declare what are the copyrights they held, what the sums they paid Mrs. Norton; thus making her feel that even the earnings of her pen are not her own in law; for, "amazing to say," she observes, "the copyright of my works, may my very soul and brains are not my own." One of the tradesmen sued on a contract undertaken by Mr. Norton to pay his wife; but it resulted from the trial that "the creditors cannot sue the 'non-existent' married woman; the husband cannot contract with a 'non-existent' married woman, and the 'non-existent' married woman cannot be compelled to pay if she refuses to discharge the debt." Mr. Norton sent her letters signed "Greensacre," inviting

her to meet him in an empty house; and when she declined to return to him, he advertised her in the papers as having left him, her family, and home. Her husband has stopped £1500 of her year's income, and she cannot raise it. "No one would lend money to a married woman; she can give no security." But it is impossible to follow this amazing case into all the details of its injustice.

I declare, says the injured wife, summing up her own case, "upon the holy sacraments of God, that I was not Lord Melbourne's mistress; and what I was, I do not believe (and nothing shall ever make me believe) that Mr. Norton ever thought that I was. In that miserable fact is the root of all my bitterness, and of all his inconsistency. He never had a real conviction (not even an unjust one) to do me wrong. He wavered, because he was making, not what he thought necessary and just, but what he imagined would 'succeed'; and sometimes one thing appeared likely to answer, and sometimes another. He thought the course he took respecting me and my children, in 1838, would answer, and so far it did answer; but he was not content with that. He thought his defence to the tradesman's action in 1843, would answer, and so far it did answer, that he is five hundred a year the richer. But he never believed the accusations on which he twice founded his guilty measures of expediency. He acknowledged he did not believe them, to others who have published his acknowledgments.

It ought not to be possible that any man, by mock invocations to justice, should serve a mere purpose of interest or vengeance; it ought not to be possible that any man should make "the law" his minister, in seeking not that which is just, but that which may "succeed."

Ought this to be? That question is the gist of Mrs. Norton's letter to the Queen. She establishes her case by reference to the testimony of Sir John Bayley, Lord Wyndford, and many other persons who are engaged, some of them on Mr. Norton's own side. She is quite right when she says, that if she had committed the offence charged against her, she would have attained freedom from her husband, and an independent existence before the law. Nay, if her husband had been more successful, and had succeeded, however falsely, in establishing the charge against her, she would have been free. More than one story shows what may be done by breaking the law instead of obeying it.

There is a case before the House of Lords this week—Sumner's divorce. In 1849 Penelope Rubina Sumner Valensmachi was married to Morton Sumner, only son of Mr. Richard Sumner, of Puttenham Priory, in Surrey; and in 1855 Morton seeks a divorce from the interval. The whole story has happened in the interval. In 1849, soon after their marriage at Corfu, Penelope writes to her husband's parents, telling them that Morton has been severely ill under an attack of brain fever. She speaks kindly of him, and evidently she devoted herself to protect his shattered health. Some few months afterwards a fall brought on a premature confinement, and she gave birth to a child. The couple returned to the Ionian Islands, they travelled in Germany, they came to England; and here, in 1850, Mrs. Morton meets her husband's parents. By this time she had conceived a repugnance to her husband, whom she declares to have been in such a state of health that, in point of fact, he had never been a husband to her. How then could she have given birth to a child? It is his father that asks the question. It must be remembered that the child was born within five months and one week of the marriage. The father's inquiry she answers that Mr. Sumner was not the father of that child, and that she would never have it. She leaves her husband; is lost to his view for some time; writes that she has procured a divorce in America, and in Corfu again marries a certain Nicholas Kallagari, with whom she is now, apparently, at Galata or Bucharest. The summons to appear before the House of Lords pursues her to Turkey; and, throwing her arms around her second husband, she hopes that in any new marriage which Morton may contract, he may be as happy as she is now. The story is told before the House of Lords this week, and the deposition of their own messenger, the Lords have no doubt as to the adultery, since Mrs. Morton Sumner has married a second time.

Mrs. Norton might attain her object, if her husband were more unscrupulous than she paints him. Another story has already been told in print, although it does not stand very conspicuously before the public. A gentleman of property is married to a lady of good connections, and of some attractions, but his desire for an heir is not gratified. He appears to be an attached husband, and certainly the lady is an attached wife. She is attentive to the household, and watches over his interests as carefully as if he were not himself capricious and nigardly. Suddenly, however, he brings forward a story that she is too familiar with one of the groom's; that she has proceeded to the last familiarity, and has even made herself notorious in the stable-yard. This statement, accompanied by the veritable circumstantial details, is told to her father, and is believed. The lady indignantly denies the calumny. Other servants are set to watch or to persecute her; the butler taking advantage of her position to become a suitor on his own account. The husband, told this fact, does not appear to disbelieve it, but does not remove the butler. Perhaps if the butler had succeeded, it would have been as useful as if the story about the groom had been true. Let the reader picture to himself a lady living in a country-house in Ireland, and subjected to treatment of this kind—her husband calumniating her, her own friends believing him, her servants conspiring against her, the butler insolently and alarmingly invading her very bedroom at night. The lady actually goes mad; and being mad, confesses that her husband's story is true. The untruth of the tale is proved by the circumstantial statement of one servant, and by a number of facts collected elsewhere, which are incompatible with the story. A judgment of the Ecclesiastical Court, however, has pronounced a divorce *a mensa et thoro*; and the husband's way to a bill in Parliament appears to be clear. Such is the story told in a pamphlet by Mr. John Paget, the barrister acting on behalf of the lady in the case of "Talbot v. Talbot."

If the husband had succeeded, Mrs. Talbot would at all events have been free Penelope Valensmachi actually became so, and is a happy woman. No matrimonial offence has been proved against Mrs. Norton; she is "non-existent" in law—in a condition worse than the slave's, for she is bound yet unprotected.

At Vienna, Mrs. Lammewski, a Polish countess, if there be any truth in the story now doing with very great success. In La Bonnamville she is described as perfect.

## MUB LEGISLATION.

(From the Spectator, July 7.)

LORD ROBERT GROSVENOR and those who supported the Sunday Trading Bill have constructed the clearest and most portable argument that has been produced for a long while to be placed at the service of those who rate theory below practice. A reasonable measure for the protection of certain humble classes so managed, as to look like an oppression dictated by religious bigotry; and it has been abandoned, so as to make the concession look as if dictated by fear instead of right feeling. The bill would not have enforced the observance of the Sabbath, "bitter" or otherwise; and it was supported by many who did not themselves sympathise with Sabbatical observance as a religious institution. The practice of trading on the Sunday in particular districts of London first attracted attention as a violation of public decency on religious grounds; and the Committee of the House of Commons that sat in 1832 obtained evidence which proved the wide extent of Sunday trading, and at the same time a very general desire on the part of traders to give up their business on the seventh day if they could be protected against the competition of each other. Fifteen years later the subject was again revived in Parliament; the tradesmen having in the mean time formed a committee, which finally merged itself into the Society for the Prevention of Unnecessary Sunday Trading, founded last year; with whom the bill actually originated. In undertaking the conduct of the bill Lord Robert Grosvenor was only fulfilling the desire of several of his constituents for a very honest and simple purpose; while the absence of any general opinion in Parliament, and its favourable reception in the House, appeared negatively, at least, to confirm the impression that he was performing a really popular service. There was, indeed, no disguising the fact that the bill was supported by many persons in all ranks of life who are anxious to enforce a strict observance of the Sabbath. That support would at all times have been suspicious, but it was rendered doubly so by the language which they employ; as if, laying aside their peculiar religious objects, they were only desirous of the social improvement of the people. Clergymen, missionaries, and members of Parliament, who had been distinguished by promoting other late measures for strict Sabbath observance, joined in this remarkable treatment of the Sunday Trading Bill, as something apart from religious improvement, and designed only for the protection of rest on temporal grounds. "It is the social improvement about which we are anxious," said the gentleman in white neckcloth and black coat. "It is not the religious but the social ground upon which we stand," said the member who is regarded as almost a clergyman. This language, intended to conciliate a more general opinion than could be mustered in support of a purely religious measure, raised a suspicion of insincerity, and has no doubt contributed to the public mystification.

A more serious mistake was made in undertaking a measure without really ascertaining whether its acceptance amongst the class to be affected by it. The circumstances that the signatures against the bill greatly outnumbered those in its favour was not absolute testimony, but all events it challenged inquiry. Lord Robert Grosvenor's plan is, that he was only fulfilling the wish of the tradesmen who had prompted the bill, and that its provisions did not interfere with labour. It is also argued, that the bill did not actually enforce attendance at Divine worship, or restrict the publican; but it is well known that the publican is under the restraint of another measure; and the promoters of all such have it in contemplation, by negative means at least, to draw the public into church by rendering its presence difficult elsewhere. This general measure was seen by all classes who did not limit their survey to the ostich view taken by the Tradesmen's Society. Many of the working people object because they are unable to obtain their wages until a late hour on Saturday night, and they require the opportunity of buying necessities on Sunday; but a still larger class object because they dislike any interference with ever with their conduct in reference to religious matters, and they do not believe in the purely temporal or social character of the measure. However confused their arguments may be, their dislike to the measure is unquestionable; and it was this dislike which Lord Robert Grosvenor and his coadjutors had neglected to ascertain. He supposed himself to be obeying a popular wish, but he was really creating a popular outbreak; and he knew so little of the subject which he had taken in hand, that he was unaware of the effect of his intervention, until the irritated working people exploded in Hyde Park.

Then was the time to determine whether the measure should be abandoned or pressed. But first in the confusion that he was acting rightly, Lord Robert Grosvenor determined to proceed, as he afterwards said, because he disliked the idea of being bullied, but of his course of duty. The English people have a sympathy with a firm man, and a clear steady explanation might have brought over some to concurrence, many more to a respectful consideration of his views; firmness and conscientious candour would at all events have reconciled the public to Lord Robert and his sincere supporters. In that case the measure could not have been made a handle for disaffection and tumult. Lord Robert was firm on Tuesday, the 16th of June: there was another riotous assemblage in Hyde Park on Sunday, the 1st of July, and on Monday, the 2nd, Lord Robert gave way. Lord Robert and his supporters were prepared to face with contempt one mob; but their conscientious firmness gave way before two mobs—the second being worse in its violence than the first. Ministers had all the while stood aloof. Sir George Grey, who had adopted the "social" or temporal arguments, but who is known to be very anxious on Sabbatarian grounds, acted as Police Minister against the mob; while Lord Palmerston hinted his sympathy with the cheer in the House of Commons at reference to the mob. Government, therefore, assumed a neutral or Austrian position on the question; another circumstance that contributed to the general mystification. Lord Robert Grosvenor added another element to the confusion. He had been threatened with the attendance of a rough regiment of volunteers "to accompany him to church;" in the House of Commons he was all confidence in the public esteem and the protection of his own constituents; but when the Sunday came, and the volunteers, Lord Robert did not realize this confidence: he did not come forth, and his house was guarded by the police. He confessed, in words, his dislike to be bullied; by his absence on Sunday he appeared to confess that he was bullied; and by the withdrawal of the bill, that the bullying was successful. The promoters of the bill, therefore, had rendered a desirable and reasonable measure impracticable: they defied

opposition until it culminated to a high point, and then they succumbed. They created an occasion for "direct" legislation by the mob; and in adopting the dictate, they rendered the comparatively small measure the opportunity for inviting a similar process with regard to other measures. The result of the demonstration in Hyde Park on two successive Sundays will not be forgotten by the demagogue, and will be used on some future occasion, probably with more disastrous consequences.

But is it the commendable object of Lord Robert Grosvenor's bill to be abandoned? The convictions and customs of the people are not to be settled by act of Parliament; but the humble traders of Lambeth pointed out the true mode of obtaining the double reform—an appeal to the common sense and justice of employers for an early payment of wages, and to the right feeling of the purchasing classes for a spontaneous forbearance from Sunday trading.

## STATE OF SEBASTOPOL.

(From the Morning Chronicle, July 19th.)

THE deserters and prisoners report that the Russian line-of-battle ships anchored in the roadstead opposite Port St. Nicholas begin to suffer from the fire of the mortar battery on the side of the Quarantine Bay. On the 27th a shell passed through the three decks of the *Tchesme*, killing and wounding several men, and then, bursting in the hold, set fire to her for a short time. Some days before a projectile, fired by a French vessel, bursting in a workshop near the Artillery Bay, caused the explosion of a number of loaded shells, killed several artillerymen, and caused such damage that the Russians have not since dared to collect together such a quantity of combustibles in one place. The shells from the allied vessels occasion much damage to the place and severe losses to the garrison. Their effects are more feared than those of the rockets. The number of naval artillerymen in the place has been reduced from 16,000 to 3500, and there are now only three artillerymen for each gun. The rations of vegetables and brandy have been diminished one-half on board the Russian vessels, and the captains of them have received orders to economise their consumption of salt pork as much as possible. The Commander-in-Chief has ordered the inhabitants to quit the town. The opinion that the place must inevitably fall into the power of the Allied armies is more and more general among the besieged, and that feeling has greatly increased their discouragement, particularly during the last few days.

## HIGH LIFE BELOW STAIRS.

SCANDAL must have something good in it. If we improve sufficiently, no doubt we shall discover that it contains some virtue, some "principle" as the chemists call it, of great use in the vital economy of society. This utility is proved by the instinctive aversion with which it is enjoyed; and the rule holds good in all classes of society. We greatly mistake if we suppose that scandal is limited to the drawing-room; it is found equally in the servants-hall, and the housekeeper's-room is not above it. Do not let us imagine, either, that it is cast off scandal that descends to those regions, or that it is about the masters and mistresses alone; depend upon it, the footman, who sneers at you after you have passed, does not expend upon you the best of his sarcasm—that is reserved for his rival. The ladies are not honoured with the strongest censures of the housekeeper, who has outlived the season of incensing envy, and has perchance arrived at the season for enjoying that passion; the concentrated essence of censoriousness falls not upon the young ladies upstairs, or upon the ladies who are not young, but upon the young ladies down stairs, who are young and are admired, and the young lady of the hall herself, who stalks in all the pride of conscious attractiveness, flaunts her happiest disparagements, not at the dowager who sits in the drawing-room, but at the dowager who wears the keys by her side. Yet not one of these human beings, erring as she may be, is so guilty as the portrait reflected in the magnifying and distorting mirror of scandal. As the calumnies that flash innumerable in the atmosphere of the drawing-room vibrate in the atmosphere of the servants-hall, so the same virtues that are tried by adversity in the upper class come out under the trials of the attendant class. An action for slander brought against a bitter-tongued lady does not draw forth a larger amount of misconduct merit than an action brought by an unprincipled lady's maid against a misconstructed housekeeper. The front wall of a gentleman's house is sometimes pulled down, as we find in the case of Fanny Ferny Potter, where a lady's maid is plaintiff against a housekeeper for slanderous language used in the presence of their mistress.

The mansion was a nobleman's; the servants-hall was tenanted by many members. There were the resident official head in the housekeeper, more than one lady's maid, a groom of the chambers, and many others. In short, the community of the servants-hall belonged to "the tip-top" of that rank. Its manners were refined; its conduct, we gather, was much under the restraint of public opinion; but the angry passions underneath lone none of their bitterness, and all can a tale unfold—with a sting at the end. The lady's maid is painted by the housekeeper as a sensitive and excitable being; she is anxious for admiration, and seeks to cast her spell upon Gunn, the groom of the chambers. Her conduct is strange, and is imputed either to insanity or to the influence of a stronger drink. Under these intoxicating agents—whether of sensitive nerves, a love of admiration, or anything else—Rose, the heroine of the tale, exhibits jealousy of the housekeeper; sends an anonymous letter, accusing that venerable personage of being a "bad woman," with language unfit for publication; and proceeds to great lengths in reference to Gunn. Such is the story of the indignant housekeeper. At the first blush the tale looks very shocking; but when we read a little further, the frightful effect is considerably modified. With regard to Mrs. Fray's being under the influence of strong drink, there is nothing but the vaguest generality, excepting a confession of her own—that a physician had once recommended her to drink a little weak brandy and water after dinner; a practice, however, which her own delicacy of mind had prevented her from obeying. The injured housekeeper explains her reason for thinking that the anonymous letter, which was ill-written, was indited by Mrs. Fray: "It resembled her diction, spelling, and writing." A sarcasm, but poor evidence. Rose's conduct to Gunn is defended; the facts stated are not denied; and it seems to be the opinion of the servants-hall that the young lady was "imprudently forward." Here, then, we look for the facts which, in the opinion of the servants-hall are damning; Rose invited Mr. Gunn to take a vacant seat by her side at the dinner table, and "asked him for flowers." We all remember Boccaccio's story of Ciappelletto, the dying reprobate, who confessed to sins of such a character, that when he has told all his enormities, the monks canonise him, and

read his garments asunder that they may possess relics of the saint. The servants-hall confesses its peccadilloes; and when it has sufficiently maligned itself, the drawing-room is obliged to ask if for such scenes as these it would stand condemned. It is true that, in her complaint of misconstruction, the excited Rose Fray went further than the facts warranted; for she declared that Mrs. Potter had pronounced Gunn, under this pursuit, to be a "second Joseph." "Sad Josepha some of us," said Charles Lamb to William Wordsworth; but then Lamb did not belong to the servants-hall, nor must the poet be judged by that elevated standard.

But, if too severe, the venerable housekeeper had her wrongs. Her sixty-two years did not protect her from the suspicions of the too-excitable Rose. In fact, between the venerable Potter and the sensitive Fray, Gunn appears to have been less like Joseph than like Garrick between Tragedy and Comedy—or rather between two Tragedies, for the story of both ladies is tearful. Mrs. Potter was accused by the younger lady, not only of inveigling Gunn into her sitting-room, but of inveigling into the same repository sixty pairs of shoes belonging to her mistress; and of callously refusing to intrust the lady's maid with "the key of the diamonds." The jealousy was repelled with dignity; the shoes were explained away; the charge of withholding the key of the diamonds was disclaimed. However prone to austerity, the good lady was above those meaneesses.

It is Gunn, however, who comes out of this trial "strong," as Mark Tapley would say. We have been accustomed to talk of the Bayard as the "chevalier sans peur et sans reproche," but in future we must talk of Gunn in that capacity. He has his foibles, but what are they against his virtues. From him we learn the manners and customs of the servants-hall; and certainly the drawing-room might copy them. Marryat was laughed at for saying that in America the legs of the pianoforte were put into floured trousers. It was thought to be a fable; but, teste Gunn, the great republic has evidently taught the moral inspiration from the servants-hall of the mother country. At the dinner-table, one day, the liveried or unliveried gentlemen of the establishment sat on one side, and on the other side sat the plain Mrs. Fray, and "another lady," an empty chair between them. Let us call to the mind's eye this distinguished table, and observe how impossible it would appear for scandal to raise its knife and fork at that meeting; and yet it did. The gentle Rose asked Gunn to come and take the vacant chair; again she asked, and yet a third time; but Gunn declined. Such actions as these it must have been that earned him the title of a "second Joseph." She also asked him to give her flowers—he confesses it; but evidently he no unskilfully insinuation in the confession. Gunn does not, in fact, appear to have been at all of the explosive species. On one occasion his feelings were excited, but not as Rose would have had them. She begged him, did that "improper" woman, to let a footman cord her boxes; but he sternly refused; and why? It must be remembered that he was not only a master of the flowers that came into the house, but also a groom of the chambers and chief of the footmen. The reason for his refusal was, he said, that Rose had told the footman to do it, without asking his leave. Gunn had the weak side of his heart, but it was not on the side of yielding to female blandishments. The idea of his being attracted by either lady was in fact absurd; for, like a true knight, he was faithful to the absent. It is stated by Mrs. Potter, that Gunn was paying his addresses to another young lady—her niece, who lives at Gravesend, and whom Gunn had visited as often as twice a year! There is a refinement and a moderation even in excess. How is it possible that a man like this could err? and yet, in the opinion of the servants-hall, that austere reputation of the blandishments of the gentle Rose earned the title of a "second Joseph." How right are the morals down stairs! How much might we learn, if we were only to study the model that is so near us! But, as Bacon says, there are some beauties that we do not discover, like the fragrance of thyme, until we trample on them: it is in that way no doubt that we discover the moral beauties of our servants.—*Spectator.*

## PRINCE GORTSCHAKOFF TO THE GARRISON OF SEBASTOPOL.

The *Gazette Militaire* of Vienna publishes Prince Gortschakoff's order of the day after the affair of the 16th. The order is couched in the following terms:—

"Comrades! The bloody combat of yesterday, and the defeat of our brave soldiers, have again crowned our arms with immortal laurels. I thank you for your heroism, and I will not refuse them. Their blood the oath which I gave to the Emperor, our common father. Thanks are given to you for it, comrades!"

"Comrades! Considerable reinforcements are marching from all parts of our sacred Russia: they will immediately be with us. Oppose to you have hitherto done, you manly braves to the murderous on of our impious enemies, and die, as thousands of us in an honourable combat—now against man, breast against breast—rather than violate the oath which you swore to the country—to preserve our Sebastopol."

"Soldiers! The enemy is beaten—driven back with enormous losses. Permit your commander to repeat to you his thanks, in the name of the Emperor, our holy and orthodox Russia. The time is at hand when the pride of the enemy will be overthrown—when his armies will be driven from our territory like straw before the wind. Under the faith in God, and fight for the Emperor and country."

"This order of the day will be read in each company and all the horse squadrons of the different bodies of troops."

(Signed) "PRINCE GORTSCHAKOFF."

AMERICAN LADIES BATHING.—C. R. Weld, who has recently published "A Vacation tour in the United States and Canada," says:—"I was greatly amused, the following morning, observing the ladies bathing; for as they are attired for the double purpose, of preserving their modesty, and of being seen, there is no impropriety in looking at the fair creatures in the water. The garments worn on these occasions are of the gayest colors, consisting of a Bloomer suit of costume, in which the upper part consists strongly with the lower. The head is generally surmounted by a quaintly shaped white cap, which seems to have made a deep impression on the author of a poem on Nahant, who says—

"Still when the sea beats on the shore,  
I sit and watch the white caps rise and fall,  
And watch the white caps rise and fall,  
The blue waves melting into foam."

In truth, it is a strange scene; and I do not abate in interest when the ladies emerge from the water, in their gaudy costumes, exhibiting treasures of all colours, and countless patches of little white feet, twinkling on the sand. This early bathing must be an conducive to health, as it is an exhilarating exercise, during my travels, I saw no ladies with such glowing complexions as those of Nahant.

Rosini's recent malady seems to have been purely nervous. He has now resumed his favourite promenades upon the Boulevard, where he may be seen strolling, as of old, with his hands in the pockets of his long frock coat, while he curiously observes the many transformations that have taken place during his absence.





2108, unguiculate.  
Terms of sale.



